

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Submitted herewith are replacement sheets for Figs. 1 and 2, each replacement sheet bears the legend “PRIOR ART” as requested by the Examiner and “REPLACEMENT SHEET” in the header. No new matter is added by this amendment.

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are in this application. Though claims 3 and 14 were previously subject to an election of species requirement to which a response was made without traverse, it is believed that the instant amendments to the claims render the election moot as now claims 3 and 14 each depend from an independent claims which was part of the elected species. Further, as outlined in the MPEP in order for these claims to be considered for allowance, if a generic claim should be found allowable, they must be amended during prosecution in accordance with the existing claims.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings and indicated that Figs. 1 and 2 should be labeled as Prior Art. Replacement sheets for Figs. 1 and 2 bearing the legend Prior Art are submitted herewith, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 6 and 7 for certain informalities, claims 6 and 7 are amended herein and believed to have removed the basis for this objection. Withdrawal is requested.

Next the office action rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. It is submitted that by this amendment the bases for the rejection have been overcome and withdrawal is requested.

On the merits the office action rejects claims 1, 2, 6-13, and 15 -17 under 35 U.S.C> § 103(a) as anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0129165 to Dingsor.

As best understood, Dingsor teaches as serves 200 which receive packets from clients 30 via NAT machine 100 and servers 200 transmit the communications packets directly to the clients 30, which may in some aspects appear similar to portions of the claimed invention in that a different server 200 may transmit the response packet to the client.

However, the one aspect of the claimed invention not shown by Dingsor is that when the response packet is transmitted to the source of the packet is modified such that upon receipt by the client it appears that it was received by the originally intended server, even if it was actually received by another server. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

transmitting and receiving unit receiving communications data with a destination address modified by the destination address modification device and transmitting response data in response to the communications data; and

a source address modification unit modifying a source address of the response data in response to the communications data with the destination address modified by the destination address modification device, to an address of a communication device that is an original destination

Somewhat similar amendments have been made to the other claims to clarify that the client or communication device receiving the response data receives the response data with an IP address which shows the response data originated for the originally intended destination.

The relied upon portions of Dingsor do not teach such a feature. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-17 patentably distinguish over the relied upon portions of Dingsor and are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Nathan Weber  
Reg. No. 50,958

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Telephone: (212) 940-8800

Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987

Docket No.: FUJO 19.290 (100794-00141)

NDW:fd